

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated October 19, 2004, the shortened statutory period for response set to expire on January 19, 2005.

I. Status of the Claims

Please amend claims 22 and 25 as indicated above. Claims 22-26 and 29-31 are currently pending in the application. Claims 22 and 25 are independent claims.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-26 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,982,762 to Anzai et al. ("Anzai") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,961 to Sanders, III et al. ("Sanders").

With regard to claim 22, the Examiner stated that Anzai teaches all of the features of the claim except the first identification information and the second identification information, but that Sanders does, and that "[i]t would have been obvious . . . to make the device adapt to include first identification information and second identification information because this would allow for the efficient relay of information between terminals and base station devices in a wireless system." Oct. 19, 20004 Office Action at pages 2-3. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

First, although Anzai discloses the use of a terminal identification information consisting of a MAC address, it does not disclose or suggest allocation of the identification information by a base station. Therefore, contrary to what the Examiner stated, Anzai does not teach a first base station that comprises memory means for storing first identification information allocated by the first base station for specifying a terminal as recited in claim 22.

Second, claim 22 as amended recites, among other things, a second base station

comprising “request means for requesting, in accordance with a signal received from the terminal and including identification information for specifying the first base station, the first base station to release the first identification information allocated by said first base station and stored in said memory means.” Anzai does not disclose or suggest this feature.

Third, although Sanders does disclose a system wherein each remote unit has an identification information, Sanders does not disclose who or what allocated those identification information. Therefore, Sanders too does not disclose or suggest a first base station that comprises memory means for storing first identification information allocated by the first base station for specifying a terminal. Sanders also does not teach the release of identification information by a base station. Thus Sanders does not disclose or suggest a second base station comprising “request means for requesting, in accordance with a signal received from the terminal and including identification information for specifying the first base station, the first base station to release the first identification information allocated by said first base station and stored in said memory means.”

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 22 is not obvious over Anzai in view of Sanders. Claims 23-24 and 29 depend on claim 22, hence they too are not obvious over Anzai in view of Sanders.

With regard to claim 25, the same arguments that were made for claim 22 apply. As indicated above, neither Anzai nor Sanders disclose or suggest allocating first or second identification information by a first or second base station to the terminal for specifying the terminal. Also, as stated above, neither of them discloses or teaches “requesting from the second base station, in accordance with a signal received from the terminal and including identification information for specifying the first base station, the first base station to release the first

identification information allocated by the first base station.”

Therefore, claim 25 is also not obvious over Anzai in view of Sanders. Claims 26 and 30-31 depend on claim 22, hence they too are not obvious over Anzai in view of Sanders.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that neither Anzai nor Sanders individually or in combination discloses all of the elements of independent claims 22 and 25 and the claims that depend therefrom.

III. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,  
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP



---

Chris L. Holm  
Reg. No.: 39,227

January 19, 2005

Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP  
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)

NY2: #4625072